Ice

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,039	01/29/2004	Hiroyuki Hatta	1538.1045	2575

21171   7590   07/16/2007
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
LEE, WILSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any . earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 April 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent·unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

Regarding Claim 1, Whitman discloses a computer-implemented search

processing method, comprising:

-    searching a predetermined document group according to a first search

     condition specified by a user to extract data of a plurality of documents

     from a storage that stores said predetermined document group (Fig. 8

     and Col. 1, lines 15-44, Col. 6, lines 1-15, Col. 6, lines 58-68; Col. 7,

     lines 1-12] and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

-    transforming said data of said plurality of documents into information to

     indicate said data of said plurality of documents to said user in a first

     display form and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized

     as a second search condition in a following processing, and outputting

     the transformed information (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line

     5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

- extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected

    by said user (Abstract and Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines 39-57

    lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines 44-64); and

- transforming said data of said documents corresponding to said selected

    display item into information to indicate said data of said documents to

    said user in a second display form specified by said user and to enable

    said user to select a display item to be utilized as a third search condition

    in a following processing, and outputting the transformed information

    (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 2, Whitman discloses that a first form showing indications of

extracted documents (recent set of query) that have been classified by used words

(search phrases previously-submitted) in said extracted documents (Col. 2, lines 13-40)

Regarding Claim 3, Whitman discloses that the first transforming comprises:

- dividing said plurality of documents into clusters (Related Searches, Top

    Matches, Full Results) by using said data of said plurality of documents

    (fig. 8);

- extracting second data to be displayed from said data of said plurality of

    documents, wherein a type of the extracted second data is predefined for

    said first display form (Abstract and Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines

    39-57 lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines 44-64); and

- generating, for each said cluster, information to display the extracted

    second data to be utilized as said second search condition in said

following processing (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 4, Whitman discloses that the first transforming comprises:

- calculating (selection process) a degree of relevancy (relevant item) between said plurality of documents by using said data of said plurality of documents (Col. 1, lines 15-24; Col. 7, lines 26-44);

- extracting, for each of said plurality of documents a data item to be displayed from said data of said plurality of documents, wherein a type of said data item is predefined for said first display form (Abstract and Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines 39-57 lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines 44-64); and

- generating information to display the extracted data items to be utilized as said second search condition in said following processing in said following processing, and a segment that connects between said data items and represents the calculated degree of relevancy between said documents corresponding to said data items (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 5, Whitman discloses dividing said plurality of documents into classes (Related Searches, Top Matches, Full Results) based on used words included in said data of said plurality of documents (fig. 8), and counting a number of documents in each said class based on a specific matter predefined for said first display form (figs. 1, 8); and generating information to display the counting result (figs. 1, 8).

Regarding Claim 6, Whitman discloses that the first transforming comprises:

- calculating (selection process) a degree of relevancy (relevant item)

  between used words included in said data of said plurality of documents

  (Col. 1, lines 15-24; Col. 7, lines 26-44); and

- generating information to display said used words to be utilized as said

  second search condition in said following processing, and a segment that

  connects between said used words and represents the calculated degree

  of relevancy between said used words (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to

  Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 7, Whitman discloses first transforming comprises:

- relating said plurality of documents into document groups (Related

  Searches, Top Matches, Full Results) based on a specific matter

  predefined for said first display form (fig. 8);

- calculating (selection process) a degree of relevancy between said

  document group and a used word included in said data of said plurality of

  documents (Col. 1, lines 15-24; Col. 7, lines 26-44); and

- generating information to display said document groups by said data of

  said specific matter, and the calculated degree of relevancy (relevant

  item) between said document group and said used word by a segment

  connecting between said document group and said used word, wherein

  said document group and said used word are to be utilized as said

  second search condition in said following processing (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 8, Whitman discloses that the second transforming comprises:

-       dividing said documents corresponding to said selected display item into

        clusters (Related Searches, Top Matches, Full Results) by using said

        data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item (fig.

        8);

-       extracting third data to be displayed from said data of said documents

        corresponding to said selected display item, wherein a type of the

        extracted third data is predefined for said second display form (Abstract

        and Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines 39-57 lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines

        44-64); and

-       generating, for each said cluster (Related Searches, Top Matches, Full

        Results, information to display the extracted third data to be utilized as

        said third search condition in said following processing (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 9, Whitman discloses second transforming comprises:

-       calculating (selection process) a degree of relevancy between said

        documents corresponding to said selected display item by using said

        data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item (Col.

        1, lines 15-24; Col. 7, lines 26-44);

-       extracting, for each said documents corresponding to said selected

        display item, a data item to be displayed from said data of said

        documents corresponding to said selected display item (Abstract and

Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines 39-57 lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines 44-64); and

- generating information to display the extracted data items to be utilized as said third search condition in said following processing, and a segment that connects between said data items and represents the calculated degree of relevancy between said documents corresponding to said selected display item (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 10, Whitman discloses that second transforming comprises:

- dividing said documents corresponding to said selected display item into classes (Related Searches, Top Matches, Full Results) based on used words included in said data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item (fig. 8), and

- counting a number of documents in each said class based on a specific matter predefined for said second display form (figs. 1, 2, 8); and generating information to display the counting result (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 11, Whitman discloses that said second transforming comprises:

- calculating a degree of relevancy between used words included in said data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item (Col. 1, lines 15-24; Col. 7, lines 26-44); and

- generating information to display said used words to be utilized as said third search condition of said following processing (Fig. 8, 810 and Col.

7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22), and a segment that

connects between said used words and represents the calculated degree

of relevancy between said used words (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 12, Whitman discloses that said second transforming

comprises:

- categorizing said documents corresponding to said selected display item

    into document groups (Related Searches, Top Matches, Full Results)

    based on a specific matter predefined for said second display form (fig.

    8);

- calculating (selection process) a degree of relevancy between said

    document group and a used word included in said data of said

    documents corresponding to said selected display item (Col. 1, lines 15-

    24; Col. 7, lines 26-44); and

- generating information to display said document groups by said data of

    said specific matter (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and

    Col. 14, lines 13-22), and the calculated degree of relevancy (relevant

    item) between said document group and said used word by a segment

    connecting between said document group and said used word, said

    document group and said work to be utilized as said third search

    condition in said following processing (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 14, Whitman discloses at least either of said first and second transformings comprises specifying a display program corresponding to a display form, and generating information for said display program (figs. 1, 2, 8).

Regarding Claim 16, Whitman discloses a computer readable medium storing instructions being executable by a processor to perform a method comprising:

- searching a predetermined document group according to a first search condition specified by a user to extract data of a plurality of documents from a storage that stores said predetermined document group (Fig. 8 and Col. 1, lines 15-44, Col. 6, lines 1-15, Col. 6, lines 58-68; Col. 7, lines 1-12] and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

- transforming said data of said plurality of documents into information to indicate said data of said plurality of documents to said user in a first display form and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as second search condition in a following processing, and outputting the transformed information (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

- extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user (Abstract and Col. 2, lines 25-40 and Col. 3, lines 39-57 lines 1-7 and Col. 5, lines 44-64);

    and

- transforming said data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item into information to indicate said data of said documents to

said user in a second display form specified by said user and to enable

said user to select a display item to be utilized as a third search condition

in a following processing, and outputting the transformed information

(Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 17, Whitman discloses that a first form showing indications of

extracted documents (recent set of query) that have been classified by used words

(search phrases previously-submitted) in said extracted documents (Col. 2, lines 13-40).

Regarding Claim 18, Whitman discloses a search processing apparatus,

comprising:

- a search unit that searches a predetermined document group according

to a first search condition specified by a user to extract data of a plurality

of documents (Fig. 8 and Col. 1, lines 15-44, Col. 6, lines 1-15, Col. 6,

lines 58-68; Col. 7, lines 1-12] and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

- a first transformer that transforms said data of said plurality of documents

into information to indicate said data of said plurality of documents to

said user in a first display form and to enable said user to select a display

item to be utilized as a second search condition a following processing,

and outputting the transformed information;

an extractor that extracts data of documents corresponding to said

display item selected by said user (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to Col.

8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22);

- ; and

-        a second transformer that transforms said data of said documents

corresponding to said selected display item into information to indicate

said data of said documents to said user in a second display form

specified by said user and to enable said user to select a display item to

be utilized as a third search condition in a following processing, and

outputting the transformed information (Fig. 8, 810 and Col. 7, line 59 to

Col. 8, line 5 and Col. 14, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 19, Whitman discloses that a first form showing indications of

extracted documents (recent set of query) that have been classified by used words

(search phrases previously-submitted) in said extracted documents (Col. 2, lines 13-40).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

Regarding Claim 13, Whitman does not explicitly disclose that a document

included in said predetermined document group is a patent document, and said display

item is either of bibliographic information of said patent document and a used word in

said patent document. However, since books and patents are both text documents. If

one can search books on a machine then one can surely search patents. There is no technical different between books and patents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to upload patent documents to the database of the Whitman's search engine to cover the usage in searching patent documents (e.g. bibliography) in order to search the book author's (if the author is also inventor) possible invention.

Regarding Claim 15, although Whitman does not explicitly disclose an arbitrary combination (any combination) of predefined display forms, however, rearranging the location of the results and display the lists in any manner does not provide unexpected and useful result. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to display the result in any desired manner or form in order to attract the user's attention based on a desired group (e.g. if user likes the section of Full Results appears first, it could be placed above the section of Related Searches.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824.

Papers related to the application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wilson Lee
Primary Examiner
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

7/9/07